

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	Fl	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,213 03/22/2004		Chun Ta Lee	3301		
25859	7590	08/03/2006		EXAMINER	
WEI TE CHUNG				FIGUEROA, FELIX O	
FOXCONN 1	INTERNA	ATIONAL, INC.			
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SANTA CLADA CA 05050			2022		

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/807,213	LEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Felix O. Figueroa	2833	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	affidavit, or other evidence of the compliance with 37 C	ence, which CFR 41.31; or						
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of									
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO									
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		TROT KEPLY WAS FILE	O VVII HIIN I VVO						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL									
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must lead to the same of the	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.						
AMENDMENTS	•	,	,						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	OTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	,, ,		the issues for						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	• ——								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	allowable if submitted in a separat	e, timely filed amendm	ent canceling						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ v	will be entered and an	explanation of						
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			-						
Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>9-12</u> .									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 									
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app ry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	hed.						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Pape	r No(s)							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument that regarding the restriction requirement, Applicant appears to be arguing a Combination - Subcombination relationship when the restriction is base on an Intermediate - Final product. Distinctness is proven for Intermediate - Final product if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a bridge / shod-circuit element; and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

In response to Applicant's argument that a rectangular cutout cannot absorb distortion, it is noted that the rectangular shape does not preclude the cutout of Pernet from absorbing distortion.

In response to applicant's argument that the blade of Pernet will not bend to be substantially parallel to the other blade, please note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case the blade of Pernet is capable of performing the intended use when the blade is positioned in a non-parallel position and then bent until is parallel with the other blade.

JUFUJSA_ Art Unit 2833